

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/826,885	04/16/2004	John J. Waycuilis	200306 USA	1419	
	7590 01/24/2007 DIL COMPANY	,	EXAMINER		
C/O LAW OFFICE OF JACK E. EBEL			NGUYEN, TAM M		
165 SOUTH UNION BOULEVARD SUITE 902			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LAKEWOOD, CO 80228			1764		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		01/24/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/826,885	WAYCUILIS, JOHN J.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	S
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute. cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commun. NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u> 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) The Tribute Tribute	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal ma		its is
Disposition of Claims	Expante quayio, 1000 o	5. 11, 100 0.0.210.	
4) Claim(s) 1-21,24,25 and 28-32 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-21,24,25 and 28-32 is/are rejected to claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and claim(s) are subject to restriction and claim(s) are subject to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	rawn from consideration. d. l/or election requirement. ner. ccepted or b) □ objected to ne drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-15	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ents have been received. ents have been received in a riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 	

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-21, 24, 25, and 28-32 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of copending Application No. 1,1/101,886. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims draw to a process for converting gaseous alkanes to liquid hydrocarbon by reacting the gaseous with bromine vapor. The copending claimed set does not specifically claim that the synthetic crystalline aluminosilicate catalyst is ZSM-5.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of copending claimed set by using ZSM-5 catalyst as a crystalline alumino-silicate catalyst because one of skill in the art would use any crystalline alumino-silicate catalyst including ZSM-5 with the expectation that any crystalline alumino-silicate catalyst would result in similar outcomes.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-21, 24, 25, and 28-32 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 11/254,438. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims draw to a process for converting gaseous alkanes to liquid hydrocarbon by reacting the gaseous with bromine vapor. The copending claimed set does not specifically claim that the synthetic crystalline aluminosilicate catalyst is ZSM-5.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/826,885 Page 4

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tam M. Nguyen Examiner Art Unit 1764

TN

Zar 1/19/07